



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/076,108

02/15/2002

Olaf Zaencker

071308.1065

8552

86528

7590

11/10/2009

King & Spalding LLP
401 Congress Avenue
Suite 3200
Austin, TX 78701

EXAMINER

DUONG, DUC T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2467

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/10/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/076,108	Applicant(s) ZAENCKER, OLAF	
	Examiner Duc T. Duong	Art Unit 2467	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 8-21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7,22 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Appeal Brief

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on August 6, 2009, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Pankaj Kumar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2467

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, and 5-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2467

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-16, and 18-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sand (US Patent 6,512,746 B1) in view of Iwama et al (US Patent 7,272,134 B2).

Regarding to claims 1 and 16, Sand discloses a system comprising a detecting unit 32, arranged at a detection point on a transmission channel between a first (left-end) and a second 38 (right-end) VoIP endpoints to collect a number of RTP speech packets transmitted between the two VoIP endpoint (fig. 3 col. 5 lines 55-62) and an arithmetic processing unit 54 INMD connected on the input side to the detecting unit to calculate a value representing the transmission quality (i.e. speech level, noise, echo, path delay) from the number of RTP speech packets collected (fig. 4 col. 6 lines 23-28).

Sand fails to teach for detecting an enumeration of RTP speech packets transmitted from the first VoIP endpoint as a first number and an enumeration of RTP speech packets transmitted from the second VoIP endpoint as a second number.

However, Iwama discloses a system and method for monitoring the performance of real-time networks by determining a number of packet count transmitted from a first VoIP endpoint 102a and a number of packet count transmitted from a second VoIP endpoint 102b (fig. 1 col. 18 lines 10-58).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time invention, to employ such packet detection as taught by Iwama into Sand's system to judge whether the average transmission delay is normal or abnormal in satisfying voice communication quality criterion.

Regarding to claims 2 and 13, Sand discloses the predetermined time period of detection for a 10 Mbit/s transmission channel is longer than 5s or in the range of about 10s to 30s (fig. 7 col. 7 line 66-67 and col. 8 lines 1-6).

Regarding to claims 5 and 18, Sand discloses the value representing the transmission quality is subjected to a threshold value discrimination in order to suppress side effects due to features of the communication protocol (col. 6 lines 29-31).

Regarding to claims 8 and 19, Sand discloses the detected first and second numbers and/or the calculated values for a plurality of first and second VoIP endpoints connected to the IP network between which bidirectional speech connections exist in each case are logged (col. 5 lines 63-65).

Regarding to claims 9 and 20, Sand discloses the detected first and second numbers for the first and second VoIP endpoints connected to the IP network within which bidirectional speech connections exist in each case are subjected to summarizing statistical processing to obtain an overall value representing the overall transmission quality of the IP network or of a section of the overall transmission quality of the IP Network (fig. 5 col. 7 lines 56-65).

Regarding to claims 10 and 21, Sand discloses the value representing the transmission quality is signaled to subscribers at the first and/or second VoIP endpoints and/or to an operation control center of the IP network (col. 6 lines 32-33).

Regarding to claims 11 and 12, Sand discloses the value representing the transmission quality is determined in real-time (col. 5 lines 55-62) and is used as an input variable for controlling the speech transmission over the IP network (col. 6 lines 23-28).

Regarding to claims 14 and 15, Sand discloses a method comprising detecting 32 at a detection point on a transmission channel between a first 38 (left-end) and a second 38 (right-end) VoIP endpoints a first number of RTP speech packets transmitted in a direction of the second VoIP endpoint (fig. 3 col. 5 lines 55-62), and a second number of the RTP speech packets transmitted in a direction of the first VOIP endpoint (fig. 3 col. 6 lines 21-22); and arithmetically process 54 INMD a value representing the transmission quality (i.e. speech level, noise, echo, path delay) from the first and second numbers (fig. 4 col. 6 lines 23-28); and wherein the value is used for routing a connection between the first and second VoIP endpoints and setting transmission parameters (fig. 3 col. 8 lines 12-18).

Sand fails to teach for detecting an enumeration of RTP speech packets transmitted from the first VoIP endpoint as a first number and an enumeration of RTP speech packets transmitted from the second VoIP endpoint as a second number.

However, Iwama discloses a system and method for monitoring the performance of real-time networks by determining a number of packet count transmitted from a first VoIP endpoint 102a and a number of packet count transmitted from a second VoIP endpoint 102b (fig. 1 col. 18 lines 10-58).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time invention, to employ such packet detection as taught by Iwama into Sand's system to judge whether the average transmission delay is normal or abnormal in satisfying voice communication quality criterion.

5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sand in and Iwama in view of Gross et al (US Patent 6,553,515 B1).

Regarding to claim 17, Sand and Iwama disclose all the limitations with respect to claim 16, except for the arithmetic processing unit have a division or subtraction stage. However, Gross discloses a method and a system for measuring network performance that include a packet division arithmetic processing (col. 19 lines 31-40). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to include a division stage as taught by Gross into Sand and Iwama's system since such arithmetic function is well-known in the art to use for network performance calculations.

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 2467

6. Claims 6, 7, 22, and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc T. Duong whose telephone number is (571)272-3122. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00 AM-6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pankaj Kumar can be reached on 571-272-3011. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. T. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2467

/Pankaj Kumar/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2467